DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 129 796 40 SP 010 511

TITLE Instructional Modules for Training Special Education Teachers: A Final Report on the Development and Field Testing of the CUNY-CBTEP Special Education Modules. Case 30-76. Toward Competence Instructional Materials for Teacher Education.

INSTITUTION City Univ. of New York, N.Y. Center for Advanced Study in Education.

SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of Personnel Preparation.; New York State Education Dept., Albany.; State Univ. of New York, Albany. Research Foundation.

BUREAU NO 451AH50466

PUB DATE Jul 76

GRANT G007-306140

NOTE 112p.; For all documents in modular cluster, see SP 010 511-517; For other related documents, see SP 010 493-511

AVAILABLE FROM Competency Based Teacher Education Project, The City University of New York, 315 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y. 10010

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Educational Research; *Field Studies; *Handicapped Children; Handicapped Students; Inservice Teacher Education; *Learning Modules; Performance Based Teacher Education; Special Education Teachers

IDENTIFIERS *Competency Based Teacher Education Project

ABSTRACT

The City University of New York Competency Based Teacher Education Project (CUNY-CBTEP) in Special Education studied Modularization, focusing on the variables in the instructional setting that facilitate learning from modular materials for a wide range of students. Four of the five modules for the training of special education teachers developed for this study were submitted to a field testing extending from the summer of 1974 through the fall of 1975. At some field test sites, instructors made extensive modifications or adaptations of the module materials. At others instructors made moderate changes to accommodate students' needs, or made no changes at all. On the college level, modules were usually incorporated as additional or alternative assignments, and at the inservice level, modules served as the basis for (1) instructor input with a group of teachers within a school, (2) independent group work within a school, and (3) independent study. The field testing and evaluation was designed to test the effectiveness of the modules as learning tools in the above varying contexts and to provide data on any needed revisions prior to widespread distribution of the modules. Results indicate that the modules have done an effective job in the development of the competencies specified in the module objectives, particularly when instructors modified the materials to meet the needs of the students and added activities that provided experiences with the handicapped. (MM)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED129796

INSTRUCTIONAL MODULES FOR TRAINING SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS

A Final Report on the Development and Field Testing of the CUNY-CBTEP Special Education Modules

Report No. CASE 30 - 76

July, 1976

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY C.A.S.E.

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER"

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The Competency Based Teacher Education Project
Center for Advanced Study in Education
The Graduate School and University Center
The City University of New York
17 Lexington Avenue
New York, New York 10010

SP010 511

The document was funded in part by the University of the State of New York, Board of Regents Research Fund, State Education Department, Office for the Education of Children with Handicapping Conditions by the U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Division of Personnel Preparation, Grant #G007 306140, Project Number 451AH50466.

Preface

The City University of New York's Competency Based Teacher Education Project (CUNY-CBTEP) has been generally involved in a large scale effort to assist developing CBTE programs since January, 1972. Specifically, the project has sponsored conferences, workshops, and seminars to provide a forum for the discussion of the many complex philosophical, practical, political and conceptual issues attending changes towards CBTE programming and to provide members of the education community with the necessary skills for implementing CBTE on college campuses and in their cooperating public schools. As needs have dictated, some research, development and evaluation activities have been undertaken to provide "hands on" experiences for program developers and to generate materials and/or data needed for program implementation.

One component of that project has been primarily concerned with CBTE issues as they pertain to the training of educational personnel for the handicapped. With the assistance provided by a sub-contract with the New York State Education Department's Division for Handicapped Children, the project has:

- addressed issues in defining competencies that are needed by educational personnel for handicapped children;
- trained a core of CUNY college faculty members in the development of instructional modules for teacher education;
- engaged in field testing the materials to evaluate developed modules, to generate data about module use; and to provide module users in both pre and inservice programs with a variety of strategies for implementation;

. developed and disseminated bibliographies, technical assistance papers, and workshop materials to assist developing programs with research, assessment, and evaluation issues attending CBTE; and
. developed and sponsored conferences and workshops on CBTE issues for special education teacher education consortia across the State.

The purposes of engaging in module development and field testing and the results of the activities are discussed in detail in the report that follows. Suffice it to say here that it has been a venture that has grown far beyond the original plans - in terms of both time and the number of people involved in one or another aspect of it. What started out to be a simple three-year, straightforward instructional materials development and field testing plan seemed to blossom into a four-year complex venture involving over 350 people. Although the developing complexity could be attributed in part to Murphey's Law (Everything is more difficult than you think, takes longer than you expect and, if anything can go wrong, it will at the worst possible moment), it is mostly owing to what was learned through formative evaluation that we questioned and sometimes changed plans at each step along the way. We feel we have learned much as a result of that process and hope that what we have learned and attempted to document in this report will be helpful to teacher education faculties as they deal with the ways and means of implementing CBTE programs.

In a venture of this kind, it is almost impossible to accurately acknowledge the roles played by so many participants. Knowing that I will probably err in overlooking someone, I still feel compelled to mention some of the special contributions made. Dr. Martin Decker coordinated the initial module development phase of the project. Dr. Norman Dodl of Florida State University developed and directed a superb workshop to get the process started. Dr. Randolph Tarrier assisted at the workshops and provided expert

guidance for the module authors who used audio-visual aids. Ellen Kolba, Sheila Crowell and Jay Watkins between them lent their professional editing expertise to all of the modules. Carolyn Gethers did the lion's share of typing and saw to it that the materials were produced in sufficient quantity and of a quality necessary for a full scale field testing.

Throughout the four years, a number of research assistants have helped the module authors, constructed instruments for the field test, tabulated and analyzed data, helped to write reports, acted as participant observers, and, in general, made themselves indispensible. They are Barbara Cohen, Marilyn Sevusa, Judy Kobrick, Judy Mayer, Alice Kornblith, Karen McCarthy, Roberta Blotner, and Lawrence Kilian.

Cecile Segal designed and coordinated almost all of the module tryout and data collection techniques and made the arrangements for the field testing of the special education modules to take place in eighteen different sites. We are indebted to her for lending her patience, persistence and organizational abilities to completing that herculean task!

From the Division of Special Education and Pupil Personnel Services of the New York City public schools, Irene Seitzer Slevin, Mimi Gordon and Ethel Glass all deserve very special thanks for insuring that the modules had a good tryout among inservice teachers. From the same division Wilese Fields Leshmore, in addition to co-authoring one of the modules, assisted in adapting her module for the large inservice workshop and helped plan a number of presentations based on the modules. Her assistance was very much appreciated.

Cecile Segal and Lawrence Kilian did most of the data interpretation, module revision, and write-ups for this report. Mr. Kilian has also presented and discussed the results of the field test with a number of groups - locally, across the state and at a national meeting of the Council for Exceptional Children.

Perhaps more than anyone else, the authors of the special education modules deserve praise, gratitude, and recognition. Dr. Shirley Cohen, Dr. Lilyan Ruderman, Mr. Marvin Stober and Mrs. Wilese Fields Leshmore all worked incredibly hard at constructing, revising, and re-revising the modules to insure that the materials to be tested were of the highest possible quality. They all gave willingly and enthusiastically of their time and talents and expertise not only to the construction of the modules but also to the many demands for extra help that the field testing placed on them.

Last, but by no means least, special mention must be made of all those to whom we assured anonymity - the "subjects" of the field testing. To the college professors and their students and to the principals, inservice trainers and classroom teachers who used the materials and answered an ungodly number of questions about their experiences, goes our profound gratitude.

Without the unique contributions of all of these people, this document would not have been possible.

Patricia M. Kay, Principal Investigator
Competency Based Teacher Education Project

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface

MODULE DEVELOPMENT

DESCRIPTION OF THE SPECIAL EDUCATION MODULES

FIELD TESTING
- Purposes
- Arrangements and Sites
- Methods
- Results and Discussion
- Summary Comments

APPENDIX

Samples of Data Collection Forms

List of Tables

	Title	Page
1.	Dates and Audiences for Module Presentations	18
2.	Field Test Sites	20
3.	Student and Instructor Ratings of Modality Linking at Site 1.	23
4.	Student Ratings of Modality Linking at Site 2.	25
5.	Student Ratings of Modality Linking at Site 3.	27
6.	Student Ratings of Modality Linking at Site 4.	29
7.	Student Ratings of Modality Linking at Site 5.	31
8.	Student Ratings of Interpersonal Perception at Site 6.	34
9.	Student Ratings of Interpersonal Perception at Site 7.	35
10.	Student Ratings of Interpersonal Perception at Site 8.	37
11.	Student Ratings of Interpersonal Perception at Site 10.	39
12.	Student and Instructor Ratings of Family Reactions to the Handicapped Child at Site 13.	43
13.	Student and Instructor Ratings of Family Reactions to the Handicapped Child at Site 14.	45
14.	Student and Instructor Ratings of How Parents Can Help at Site 14.	46
15.	Student Ratings of Family Reactions to the Handicapped Child at Site 15.	48
16.	Student and Instructor Ratings of Family Reactions to the Handicapped Child at Site 18.	51
17.	Student and Instructor Rating of How Parents Can Help at Site 18.	52

MODULE DEVELOPMENT

When the module development and field testing project was originally planned at the City University of New York in September 1972, there was an overwhelming number of questions being raised about the development and use of instructional modules for teacher education programs. "Modules" themselves were relatively recent innovations. Although they were fairly new to teacher education, a few institutions around the country (mostly those with a good bit of financial assistance) were attempting to modularize their programs.

To many of the CUNY Competency Based Teacher Education Project committee members, it appeared that modularization had grown out of a fairly rigid instructional technology. There was widespread misunderstanding both within and outside the university that modularization was synonymous with competency based education. Some critics of modules (often those who knew little about them) maintained that their use would insure programs that would be inflexible, behavioristic, fragmented, and inhumane. Some proponents of modules (often those who knew little about them) regarded modules as a panacea for individualized instruction and looked forward to the time when there would be national banks of modules that could be used in any teacher education program. There could be a bit of truth in both of those extreme positions and that truth is basically what this project set out to uncover and document.

There are many different versions of what a module is. They range all the way from "a loosely organized unit of instruction" to "a completely self-contained instructional package." The notion of module that was investigated in this study was the latter. The modules that were developed were intended to be complete units of instruction with all the materials

needed to complete them - including instructions to students, readings, directions and materials for instructional activities, tests, test answer keys, instructor manuals and any necessary audio visual aids. It was felt that only if materials could "stand by themselves" that is, be used by teachers in training without instructor input, could we obtain fair answers to the questions concerning the potential of modules for individualization and only if they were complete packages could we obtain fair estimations of the potential for generalizability.

Before getting to those questions, however, a first set of queries concerned the development or construction of the modules. What kind of staffing patterns were needed to construct modules? Could teacher education faculty, realistically, construct quality materials as a routine aspect of their jobs? What kind of special training was necessary for module developers? How long would it take? Could modules be developed for a wide variety of disciplines and contexts and objectives?

There were two main goals that guided the module development phase of the project. The first was based on the assumption that there might be a great deal of potential good in the notion of program modularization or, at the very least, that it was an option for program development that should be available to faculties as they were to contemplate program renewals. The goal was to assist faculty in acquiring skills in module development and use and, in so doing, to develop the potential for module development in each of the senior college teacher education programs and in a wide variety of specializations across the university. Some of the module development procedures that evolved addressed this need for training faculty from a variety of programs, colleges and specializations. It was hoped that documenting the process would lead to answers to some of the questions about module development.

A second main goal of the module development phase of the project was to generate modularized materials of the best possible quality to submit to field testing. The field testing was intended to answer questions about the need for module revision in varying contexts, the role of instructors in module use, student and instructor attitudes toward modularized instruction and, in general, the many questions that had been raised about module use. Obviously, it would not have been possible to investigate these questions with poorly developed materials (as many of the modules available from other sources at that time were!)

It is necessary to know the structure of the CUNY-CBTE Project to fully understand how the module authors were chosen and the modules constructed. When the project was initiated, in January 1972, each dean or department chairperson from the eight senior college teacher education programs nominated a member and an alternate from their institution to each of twelve university-wide CBTEP committees. The committees were organized around twelve areas of specialization within education: reading, mathematics, science, bilingual education, classroom management, administration, guidance, social and philosophical foundations, psychological foundations, human relations, early childhood education, and, of particular interest in this report, special education. The choice of those twelve areas was mostly arbitrary. There was no intention of structuring the committees so that all teacher education interests would be represented and there was certainly an overlapping of interests among committees. The committees were simply organized such that there would be representatives from all of the colleges in each group and each group had a particular focus for investigating CBTE issues and problems.

During the first six to nine months of the project prior to module development, committee members had been engaged in discussions of a general

nature about CBTE, had attended conferences designed specifically for them to become as knowledgeable as possible about CBTE, had read extensively in the CBTE literature that was available at the time, and had undertaken the process of beginning to define teaching competencies that were unique to their special areas of interest.

As the module development phase of the project was started, each committee was given an introduction to what modules were and how we planned to get a set of them developed and tested. Each committee elected one or more members to attend a module development workshop where the specifications for the module were to be developed. The committees, in addition to approving the potential module authors, also had to review and approve the competency and/or objectives that were to be addressed in the modules. A total of forty-two CUNY faculty members signed up for the workshop and were approved, along with their module topics, by their respective committees. Six of those people were members of the special education committee.

The workshop was held on two occasions in December at a retreat location near New York City. Each lasted for two and a half days. Dr. Norman Dodl, of Florida State University served as workshop developer, faculty trainer and general consultant for the workshops. The workshop format was, itself, modularized and was built around Developing Instructional Modules by W. Robert Houston at the University of Houston. Being the "students" in a modularized instructional format gave the faculty member participants an appreciation for the process as well as providing them with models of materials and processes which might be incorporated into their plans.

Each faculty participant (or group of them, since there were several groups collaborating on one module) spent the time learning "how to" and developing specifications for each component of their planned module. Each set of module specifications was reviewed by the whole group of module

authors before leaving the workshop. Subsequent to the workshops, the CBTEP committees discussed, and sometimes revised, the module plan and contracts were then drawn up for the authors to develop the materials according to the approved specifications.

Not all workshop participants elected to finish the modules. Several potential module authors decided not to continue in the process owing, primarily, to insights gained during the workshops about the amount of time and effort that would need to be devoted to the task. It should be noted that all module authors undertook the work in addition to their regular load of teaching, research, college committee, consulting and advising assignments. All of the module authors were given honoraria for their involvement in the project. The amount however did not begin to reimburse them for the time spent on the task.

Each module author worked closely with an educational psychologist on the project staff who provided technical advice, guidance and encouragement. Authors were also assisted by audio-visual experts from the Guidance Laboratory of the City University of New York and by the other members of their respective CUNY-CBTEP committees.

A total of sixteen modules (some with multiple authors) were completed in draft form by June 1972. Five of the modules addressed special education competencies. The five were:

- Activities and Material: Selection for Unimodality functioning;
- Assessing Children's Cognitive Abilities - A Neuropsychological Approach;
- Interpersonal Perception in the Teaching-Learning Process in Special Education;
- Prescriptive Teaching Techniques for Use with Disabled Children;
- How Parents Can Help: Enlisting Parent Involvement in the Education of Young Handicapped Children.

A review of all modules (special education and others) by project staff and consultants indicated that there were a number of improvements that were needed before the materials could be produced and placed in the hands of students and instructors for the field testing. In almost all of the modules the directions to students needed to be made more explicit. This was particularly true in the case of modules in which students were to move from one section to another or where the student could exit early or skip particular elements. Most of the modules needed to be made more self-contained i.e., more actual teaching had to be done within the developed materials as opposed to sending students to extensive "outside" readings. Some modules were lacking instructors' manuals and answer keys for the assessments. It was not always clear whether the materials were intended for pre-service, in-service, graduate or undergraduate students, or how much time it should take them to complete the materials. And finally, the largest and most interesting kind of problem: most faculty members had difficulty in addressing students directly in their written materials. The style which should have been somewhat akin to writing letters or notes to students was a mixture of informal language and scholarly writing (as for a journal).

In order to make the modules available for field testing and ultimately suitable for use in colleges outside the City University system, where they might serve as prototypes for further module development, it was deemed necessary to have them edited and revised. To that end, the project employed professional manuscript editors whose work included:

- initial review of all modules for general understanding;
- specific review of modules for literary style, consistency of format, etc.;
- meetings with module authors for discussions of suggested revision, rewriting, etc.

- assistance in actual rewriting, reorganization and revision of modules; and
- development of a prototype for instructors' manuals for all modules.

The intent of the editing was to assure that each module would exist in a form which would easily allow a college instructor to implement it without outside assistance. This required that each module contain instructions to faculty for appropriate use, student directions which were clear and explicit, information on time factors, reliable and reasonable assessment procedures, and modular material in a form which was readable, clear, well organized and sequential.

During the module editing phase of the project, two of the special education modules were dropped from the process because of a joint agreement between the authors and project staff that their scope would encompass not one but a whole series of modules. Another module that also encompassed too much material was divided into three sections so that a module cluster (i.e., three sequential modules) was ultimately developed and edited.

Because of the extensive editing process that took place, the actual field testing was delayed by one, and in some cases, two terms. At the end of the editing process, however, there were twelve modules that project staff, module authors, and committee members agreed were of good quality and ready to be field tested in a wide variety of locations and contexts.

The remainder of this report pertains only to the special education modules and addresses their descriptions as well as field test purposes, methods and results.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SPECIAL EDUCATION MODULES

Each of the modules that survived the development and editing phases of the project contained the following parts:

- an Overview which is a prospectus or introduction that presents the rationale behind the module, its major assumptions, and where it fits into the overall scheme of becoming a teacher;
- Objectives which specify the knowledge, skills and/or attitudes that the learner is expected to demonstrate upon successful completion of the module;
- a Pre-assessment which measures prerequisite abilities and/or the learner's previously acquired competency in the objectives of the module;
- Enabling activities which present routes (sometimes alternative) by which the learner can accomplish the objectives, and
- a Post-assessment which measures what the learner has accomplished relative to the module objectives.

Outlines of each of the five special education modules follow.

Interpersonal Perception by Lilyan Ruderman

Terminal Objective:

You will be able to use your awareness of yourself and of others to effectively teach academic skills to disabled or exceptional individuals.

Objective for Element I:

You will demonstrate awareness of your own feelings about a variety of disabilities by analyzing your reaction to a simulated disability or handicap of your own and to the disabilities of others.

Activities:

Students simulate perceptual handicaps (e.g., blindness) in order to experience what it is like to carry out certain academic or perceptual skills under handicapping conditions. Each student works with a partner and they observe each other's reactions to the tasks.

Students, working with a partner, have a choice of:(a) viewing a film and recording their affective reactions to handicapping conditions; (b) reading a book by or about a person who is handicapped and attempting to relate to the situation; or (c) looking at a set of pictures and creating a story about the persons in the pictures using guidelines in the modules.

Students have a choice of:(a) reading the article "Adjustment by Misfortune - A Problem of Social - Psychological Rehabilitation" by Demo, Leviton and Wright and recording their interviews with injured subjects in the Appendix of the article, or (b) visiting three exceptional individuals.

Objective for Element II:

You will demonstrate an awareness of the feelings of others that will help you work effectively with handicapped or learning disabled people by accurately identifying the affective reactions of another person in specific interpersonal situations.

Activities:

Students may choose to: (a) act as an observer and participant in a role-playing situation simulating interaction between a disabled learner and teacher, or (b) identify and describe the feelings of students participating in experiential exercises.

Students may choose to:(a) read selected literature; (b) view a set of slides; or (c) view three films and identify and respond to the feelings of handicapped persons in the medium selected.

Students must observe a real situation in which an exceptional person is in interaction with one or more other people. A part of this interaction is video taped and the individual is interviewed. Students' observations and interviews are discussed in the group.

Objective for Element III:

You will demonstrate an awareness of your feelings and the feelings of

others by analyzing a teacher-learning situation under real or simulated handicapping conditions and by successfully teaching academic skills to handicapped or disabled persons.

Activities:

Students choose to: (a) produce a video-tape in which a teacher successfully teaches a specific academic skill to three disabled individuals, or (b) role-play two handicapped or disabled learners and then two teachers in simulated teaching-learning situations.

Students must teach a specific academic skill to an individual special child and then to at least three special children.

Assessment Procedures:

This module contains comprehensive pre-assessment and post-assessment procedures, as well as a brief post-assessment following each element. The post-assessment following each element is used by the instructor and student to determine if the student can proceed to the next element.

Students successfully completing the pre-assessment need not go ahead with the module. There are, however, no different entry levels. The pre and post assessment procedures are identical. In Part 1, students must compare three theories of interpersonal perception and cite names of three persons connected with each. In Part II, students must draw a teacher at work in the classroom. Upon completion of the module, they evaluate their own pre and post assessment drawings. Part III is a "Social Opinion Scale" in which students respond to a number of questions about their perceptions of others and themselves. Part IV, "Interpersonal Perception Evaluation," involves looking at a series of pictures. Students must respond to questions about the pictures which attempt to get at the students feelings about the interactions taking place in the pictures.

Modality Linking by Marvin Stober and Wilease Fields

Terminal Objective:

Given the appropriate assessment data about the child you will identify the child's modality strengths and weaknesses and plan a progression of learning experiences which uses the strong modality to strengthen the weak modality.

Objective for Element I:

You will demonstrate your ability to identify modality components and classify materials and tasks according to these components.

Activities:

Students are required to complete a role playing activity which introduces them to the notion of sense modalities.

Students have a choice of completing several preliminary activities which demonstrate that people have preferred sense modalities. Choices include:

1. reviewing a film and identifying sense modalities;
2. reading an excerpt from Kirk and Kirk (1971) and considering modality strengths; or
3. listening to an audio cassette on the modality characteristics of activities and materials, and considering questions in the module.

Students are required to create a series of activities and materials which teach to a modality strength. They must present them to a group of students and the instructor who decide if they are adequate.

Objective for Element II:

You will demonstrate your ability to select a series of activities and materials that meet specific modality requirements.

Activities:

Students are required to complete a programmed learning section on the input and output modes of sensory channels.

Students have a choice of (a) evaluating materials from a materials center and presenting the evaluation to a group of 3 to 5 students which decides on its merit, or (b) evaluation using commercial supply catalogues instead of actual materials. Given assessment information about a child, students plan a series of activities using materials evaluated previously and present them to the instructor, either orally or in written form.

Assessment Procedures:

The preassessment contains two case histories and a series of questions dealing with ascertaining a child's strengths and weaknesses and determining what information in the case histories is relevant in planning a program for the child. Students are asked to plan programs for one of the children taking into account the strengths and weaknesses of the child. Successful completion of the preassessment exempts students from the module. However, the preassessment does not provide for different entry points into the module. The preassessment is submitted in written form to the instructor.

The post assessment provides four sets of diagnostic information in the form of descriptive summaries that a teacher might write. Students must submit, in written form, a lesson plan detailing activities and materials that require progressively more of the child's weak modality functioning and less of his strong modality functioning.

Module I, Family Reactions to the Handicapped Child
by Shirley Cohen

Terminal Objective:

You will identify possible effects of the reaction patterns of two families with young handicapped children upon the child's "teachability."

Objectives for Element I:

You will become familiar with the initial reactions, long term concerns and everyday problems of the parents of a handicapped child.

You will describe two attitudinal and two cognitive achievements important to school participation and describe three long-term concerns parents.

Activities:

Students visit two families and interview two parents of handicapped children and write a report based upon specific questions.

Objective for Element III:

You will act as a parent surrogate to a handicapped child and then examine and identify your own feelings.

Activities:

Students babysit for a handicapped child, take the child on a neighborhood excursion and then write a report.

Objective for Element IV:

You will analyze changes in your attitudes (if any) towards parents of handicapped children brought about by this module.

Activities:

Group discussion.

Assessment Procedures:

The pre and post-assessments are identical for this module. The assessment is a written test containing seven questions. Performance on specific questions on the pre-assessment determines the student's entry level in the module. In the first five questions the students are asked to list: a) various aspect of being the parent of a handicapped child, and b) attitudinal and cognitive achievements of the child. In question six the students are asked to imagine how they would feel taking a Down Syndrome child to a playground. In the last question the students are asked to make comparisons (based on observations in the home) of two families with handicapped children. They are to include mention of how various conditions effect the "teachability" of the child.

Module II, How Parents Can Help
by Shirley Cohen

Terminal Objective:

Given a description of a group made up of five parents of young handicapped children, you will demonstrate skill in planning and carrying out a workshop on home-teaching, under simulated conditions.

Objective for Element I:

You will state: 1) different kinds of information parents and teachers need to exchange; 2) reasons why and the ways in which parents should be involved in the education process; and 3) the current attitudes of educators towards parental involvement in the education process.

Activities:

Students answer 20 true-false questions based on five readings. Students ask four educators to fill out a questionnaire on their attitudes towards parental involvement and discuss the results.

Objectives for Element II:

You will name and describe two parent organizations and two home-based programs for young handicapped children.

You will describe the guidelines, benefits and cautions about using parents as teacher aides.

Activities:

Students read material about and by parent organizations, visit two meetings of parent organizations, and speak to parents who work as teacher aides.

Students view the film "Learning in Joy" and discuss the film considering six questions listed in the module.

Objective for Element III:

You will develop preparatory skills in communicating with parents and in planning both individual conferences and group workshops with parents.

Activities:

Students read articles related to parent-teacher conferences and using written protocols, they must: 1) label effective reactions to parents and teachers; 2) correct and supply the teacher's comments in conferences; and 3) write a script for a parent-teacher conference and role play it.

Assessment Procedures:

The pre and post-assessment are identical for this module. The assessment is a written test containing eleven questions. Performance on specific questions on the pre-assessment determines the student's entry level in the module. In the first four questions, students are asked to list various aspects of the cooperative role of parents and teachers in the education of the handicapped child. Students are asked in several of the questions to cite and discuss parent organizations and home-based or parent-intervention programs. In Question 11, students are presented with an excerpt from a parent-teacher conference and asked to respond to several questions analyzing the meeting. In the last question, students are asked to plan a workshop for five parents of handicapped children.

Module III, Parents as Partners: Home-School Plans
by Shirley Cohen

Terminal Objective:

You will demonstrate skill in: implementing a home-school plan for one of your pupils, and carrying out a workshop for parents of the pupils in your class.

Objectives for Element I:

You will design a set of questions for soliciting information from parents relative to educational planning.

You will effectively conduct a parent teacher conference to gather information relevant to educational planning.

Activities:

The students discuss and evaluate information gathering forms. They prepare a list of questions and they video tape a parent-teacher conference.

Objectives for Element II:

You will be able to design an effective home-school plan for one pupil in your class.

Activities:

The students discuss sample home follow-up guides. They prepare a plan for one child and then carry the plan through with the parent(s).

Objective for Element III:

You will be able to conduct an effective group meeting for parents of children in your class.

Activities:

The students discuss ideas taken from sample workshops. They identify an objective for a group meeting, plan the meeting and then conduct it.

Assessment Procedures:

The preassessment asks students to describe in detail how they have obtained information from parents, how they developed and implemented a home-school plan, and how they conducted a group workshop. The student is assigned to a particular entry level based on his performance. The post assessment is included in three parts, one part after each element. For Elements I & II the instructor evaluates a report and video tape of a parent teacher conference. Supplemental activities are provided for those who fail. For Element III the student and a peer observer write a report on the parent group workshop conducted by the student.

FIELD TESTING

Purposes

The field testing of the special education modules was conducted from the summer of 1974 through the fall of 1975. The purposes of the field testing were the following:

- to "try out" the modules in both preservice and inservice settings under a wide variety of instructional conditions in order to collect data on their effectiveness;
- to collect data on instructor and student attitudes towards ratings of the effectiveness of the modules;
- to discover any aspects of the modules which were in need of clarification or revision;
- to explore the conditions under which the modules are effective, e.g. can the modules serve as self instructional packages, can the modules be used effectively in a variety of contexts, i.e., workshop, preservice and inservice, and are the modules adaptable to a wide variety of handicapping conditions?

Arrangements and Sites of the Field Testing

Arrangements to secure field test sites were made by publicizing the availability of the modules through presentations at conferences and to various groups of educators, and through a mailing. Specifically, the special education modules were presented to the CUNY-CBTE Special Education Committee (Feb., 1974), the CUNY faculty at the CUNY-CBTE Module Conference (May, 1974), and to the New York State Special Education Consortia (May and Oct., 1974). A mailing was made to the CUNY faculty (Jan., 1975) and the project staff presented the modules to numerous groups of educators. The dates and audiences of these module presentations are listed in Table 1.

Table 1

Dates and Audiences for Module Presentations

Date	Audience
February, 1974	CUNY-CBTEP Special Education Committee
March, 1974	Queens College Faculty
March, 1974	Principals of Special Schools, New York City Board of Education
April, 1974	Members of Council for Exceptional Children (Annual Meeting)
May, 1974	Associate SEIMCs
May & October, 1974	Special Education Consortia - New York State
May, 1974	CUNY Faculty at the CUNY-CBTE Module Conference
October, 1974	New York City Board of Education personnel
January, 1975	Bureau CRMD, New York City Board of Education
January, 1975	Faculty, School for the Deaf
January, 1975	Faculty, School for the Deaf
January, 1975	Faculty, School for the Multiply Handicapped
January, 1975	Bureau Socially Maladjusted and Emotionally Disturbed, New York City Board of Education
February, 1975	Instructors of in-service orientation for new teachers, New York City Board of Education
February, 1975	Bureau of Child Guidance, New York City Board of Education
March, 1975	Transitional Classes, New York City Board of Education
April, 1975	Staff of PS 370K
April, 1975	Staff of Districts 26 and 28, Queens

At each of the module presentations, basically the same format was followed. Each included a presentation about the history and purposes of the project; a brief description of each of the modules, discussion of the field test purposes and procedures, and opportunity to look at the materials and discuss them with project staff. In many cases, the module authors accompanied project staff to these presentations. Frequently, sets of materials were left with audience members to allow for more extensive review.

Those who wished to become involved in the field test "signed up" on a form designed for that purpose. Prospective participants were asked to include information about the potential students (inservice, preservice; private college, public college, CUNY; ages; etc.) and the courses or training contexts in which the materials would be tested.

It was not possible to fill all the requests made by college faculty or public school personnel to become part of the formal field testing. Of those requesting to take part, approximately half were chosen. In some cases (for some of the very popular modules) there were not enough materials to go around. In other cases, the arrangements for data collection would have been too cumbersome. All "rejected" field test sites were, however, sent copies of the materials for their own use.

Those sites that remained represented a broad variety of contexts. Field testing took place at eighteen locations including inservice courses and workshops of the New York City Board of Education and State Department of Education, and graduate courses in public and private colleges within and outside New York City. Table 2 presents a complete list and description of field test sites, modules tested at each, and the number of subjects at each.

Methods

In order to field test the modules under conditions most closely

Table 2

Field Test Sites

Site #	Module(s) Used	Description of Site	Sample Size
1	Modality Linking	CUNY Graduate Course	22
2	Modality Linking	Inservice course	11
3	Modality Linking	Inservice course	5
4	Modality Linking	Inservice course	5
5	Modality Linking	Inservice workshop	130
6	Interpersonal Perception	CUNY Graduate Course	23
7	Interpersonal Perception	CUNY Graduate Course	9
8	Interpersonal Perception	CUNY Graduate Course	9
9	Interpersonal Perception	Private College Graduate Course	10
10	Interpersonal Perception	Inservice course	1
11	Interpersonal Perception	Inservice course	4
12	Interpersonal Perception	Inservice course	4
13	Family Reactions	CUNY Graduate Course	23
14	Family Reactions and How Parents Can Help	Inservice course	9
15	Family Reactions	Inservice course	3
16	Family Reactions and How Parents Can Help	Private College Graduate Course	4
17	Family Reactions	Inservice course	4
18	Family Reactions and How Parents Can Help	CUNY Graduate Course	22

approximating the usual use of prepared material in teacher training, the instructors who used the modules were allowed to implement the modules as they saw fit. Consequently, the modules were used in different ways with differing degrees of instructor input and in some cases the modules were adapted or revised.

To insure the collection of adequate data on the effectiveness of the modules, and student and instructor reaction to them relative to the manner in which they were implemented, a number of different data collection modes were employed. Data were collected through the use of questionnaires distributed to instructors and students, through the use of reports of participant observers, and through the examination of work samples of the students.

The questionnaires asked the instructors and students to rate the effectiveness of the modules in terms of such considerations as clarity, provision for feedback, importance of topic, amount of student learning, and the effectiveness of the individual learning activities. The participant observer reports were helpful in determining how the instructor was implementing the module, what the students' reactions were and how the modules were adapted or revised. It was necessary to alter the basic questionnaires to fit situations in which the modules were modified or revised. Samples of the evaluation forms used are included in the appendix.

Results and Discussion

The results of the field testing are presented here by module title and by site. The results for each site are presented separately along with a description of any adaptations made in the materials, and other information from participant observers' reports. Following the results of all sites for a particular module, is a discussion section.

Site 1 - Modality Linking

The sample consisted of 22 students enrolled in a graduate course. Seventy percent of the students in the course had had regular teaching experience.

The responses to the "Student Reaction Questionnaire" indicated that the students judged that their competence in the use of modality linking increased "somewhat" as a result of completing the module. They rated the activities of the module for acquiring the competency as "good" but their enjoyment of the activities as "fair". A "fair" rating was also given to "amount of practice" and "provision for feedback". Students found peer grouping a "good" working arrangement for carrying out the activities of the module. In terms of educational content, interest level and relevance to teaching, the module was rated "about equal" to other education courses. The students' ratings of the activities of the module and their judgements of the effectiveness and comparative value of the module are included in Table 3.

The participant observer report indicated that the module was introduced as an additional assignment several weeks after the course had started. Consequently, other course requirements were reduced and one class session was eliminated. Class time was to be used only to handle problems with the module.

The "Instructor Questionnaire" indicated that the whole module, with the exception of the pre-assessment was assigned. The instructor felt the pre-assessment was not directly related to the module nor was it a true measure of the students' competence. The instructor's rating of the learning activities was generally favorable. The rating of the module's effectiveness as "very good" and "good" were higher than the student ratings. The instructor did not adapt or change the material in the module. The instructor's ratings of the individual learning activities and the

Table 3

Student and Instructor Ratings
of Modality Linking at Site 1.

Question	Student* Ratings	Instructor Ratings
How would you rate the learning activities in terms of:		
. Sequence	Good	Good
. Level of sophistication	Good	Good
. Kinds of tasks	Good	Very good
. Amount of practice	Fair	Good
. Provision for feedback	Fair	Not helpful at all
. Overall value of activities	Good	Fair
. Role play	Good	Good
. Audio-visual material	Good	Very good
. Readings	Good	Very good
. Visit to materials center	Good	Good
. Presentation of lesson plan	Good	Good
. Enjoyment	Fair	-
How much did the module increase your ability to:		
. Identify modality components	Somewhat	Very good
. Select activities and materials	Somewhat	Very good
. Plan experiences relative to modality strength then weakness	Somewhat	Good
How would rate this module in comparison to materials in other courses in terms of:		
. Educational content	About equal	-
. Interest level	About equal	-
. Relevance to teaching	About equal	-

* N = 22

overall effectiveness of the module are also listed in Table 3.

Site 2 - Modality Linking

The sample consisted of 11 teachers enrolled in an inservice course for new teachers. Seventy percent of the teachers had previously taken at least one special education course and all were working with deaf children.

The participant observer reports indicated that four class sessions were devoted to the module. One of the module authors assisted the instructor in modifying and adapting the contents of the module. An informal case study was assigned in place of the pre-assessment.

Students, in answering the "Student Reaction Questionnaire", gave positive ratings to the learning activities in helping them understand and apply the concept of modality linking. Of the 5 activities specifically rated, "preparing a case study" was viewed the most positively (mean rating of "Very Good"). The other activities received a "good" rating except for the use of the cassette which was rated as "fair". The students felt that modality teaching was a valuable technique to use with the children in their classes (mean rating of "very Good"). Half of them had already tried it out with limited success. The group as a whole stated that the concept of modalities as an approach to teaching should be included in future orientation sessions for new teachers, preferably at the beginning of the school year. Table 4 represents a list of the student ratings of the individual learning activities and an overall rating of the effectiveness and comparative value of the module.

Table 4

Student Ratings of
Modality Linking at Site 2

Questions	Student* Ratings
How would you rate the following learning activities:	
. Preparing a case study	Very good
. Role play	Good
. Cassettes	Fair
. Presentation of resource material	Good
. Development of lesson plan	Good

* N = 11

Site 3 - Modality Linking

The sample consisted of 5 special education teachers who were enrolled in an inservice course. All had previously taken at least one course in special education and were teaching children with retarded mental development.

The participant observer reported that, at first, the instructor implemented the module without any adaptions, but when she found insufficient work progress she provided the students with an outline of expected completion dates and made extensive modifications in the module activities to make the material more relevant to the special education population with which the teachers were dealing.

Student reaction to the module, as measured by the "Student Reaction Questionnaire," was positive. They rated it as an extremely valuable technique for use with children in their classes. With the exception of the cassette presentation which was rated "Fair" the learning activities received favorable ratings. Of these, "role playing" and "development of activities utilizing modality linking" were rated the most valuable experiences for learning what modality teaching is and how to use it in the classroom. Students indicated that the module significantly increased their ability to plan a progression of learning experiences which built first upon a child's modality strength while strengthening his modality weaknesses. The students' ratings of the individual activities as well as their judgements on the comparative value and effectiveness of the module are listed in Table 5.

Site 4 - Modality Linking

The sample consisted of 5 special education teachers who were enrolled in an inservice course and who were working with emotionally handicapped children.

Table 5

Student Ratings of

Modality Linking at Site 3

Questions	Student* Ratings
How would you rate the following learning activities:	
. Using a case study	Very good
. Role play	Excellent
. Cassette	Fair
. Evaluation of material	Very good
. Development of activities	Very good
. Film	Good
How much did the module increase your ability to:	
. Identify modality components	Between somewhat & a great deal
. Select activities and materials	Between somewhat & a great deal
. Plan learning experiences relevant to modality strengths and weaknesses	Between somewhat & a great deal
How would you rate this module in comparison to materials used in other courses in terms of:	
. Educational content	About equal
. Interest level	Much better
. Relevance to teaching	Better

* N = 5

The participant observer report indicated that the students used the modular materials under the close supervision of the instructor. Each student was required to complete a case study of one of the children in her class. The case studies were used as a basis for conducting the other activities of the module. Thus the module was adapted to the particular special education population with which the students were working.

Tabulation of the "Student Reaction Questionnaire" revealed that all the activities were rated "very good" with the exception of the cassette and film activities which were rated as "good". In general, the students felt the module increased their ability in the area of modality linking and they rated the module as "better" than traditional approaches. The ratings of the specific activities as well as the general evaluations of the module are listed in Table 6.

Site 5 - Modality Linking

The sample consisted of 130 staff members (including supervisors, teachers, paraprofessionals, guidance counselors and curriculum coordinators) of a special education program of a public school system. All teachers were working with emotionally handicapped children.

The module was extensively adapted to be used as an all day workshop. The participant observer reports cover meetings held to adapt the module to a workshop format as well as the workshop itself. A number of meetings were held with the staff planning the workshop and one of the module authors to: adapt the module to a workshop format, rewrite some of the module activities, and select audio-visual materials relevant to the special educational population served by the program. New case histories were written to substitute for those included in the pre-assessment and the role play activities were rewritten. The workshop covered two of the three elements of the module.

Table 6

Student Ratings of

Modality Linking at Site 4

Questions	Student* Ratings
How would you rate the following learning activities:	
. Using a case study	Very good
. Role play	Very good
. Cassette	Good
. Evaluation of material	Very good
. Development of activities	Very good
. Film	Good
How much did the module increase your ability to:	
. Identify modality components	Between somewhat & a great deal
. Select activities and materials	Between somewhat & a great deal
. Plan learning experiences relevant to modality strengths and weaknesses	Between somewhat & a great deal
How would you rate this module in comparison to materials used in other courses in terms of:	
. Educational content	Better
. Interest level	Better
. Relevance to teaching	Better

* N = 5

Of the 130 staff members attending the conference, 114 handed in the evaluation form. They rated the topic of modality linking between "Important" and "Very Important" for planning a program of study for the kind of children they teach. Classroom personnel as well as other staff members agreed that the conference successfully met the three stated objectives. The mean ratings for the objectives ranged from "very good" for the objective dealing with an awareness of the concept of modality incorporation style to "good" for the objectives dealing with the implementation of the technique. Participants felt that all of the learning activities helped them in meeting the stated objectives. Overall, the ratings for the activities ranged between "good" and "very good". Table 7 presents the ratings of the individual learning activities as well as the evaluation of the degree to which the workshop met its objectives.

In addressing questions designed to provide feedback for the sponsors of the conference, participants' responses provided data about the effectiveness of the conference format for utilization of the module. More than half (54%) of the participants felt that the topic was satisfactorily handled. The remaining 46% would have liked additional input as well as more time for the activities that were presented. Their comments indicated that they particularly wanted help in applying the technique and that more specificity and depth as well as "how to do it" demonstrations were needed. In line with this nine participants also mentioned that they would have liked to have a greater emphasis on the case study and its relation to the activities at the conference.

Discussion - Modality Linking

While the module was generally effective in a variety of settings it was most effective in sites 2 through 5. In those sites the instructors took an active role in the module and they adapted the modular material to

Table 7

Student Ratings of
Modality Linking at Site 5

How would you rate the following learning activities:	Para N=33	Teacher N=50	Guid. Couns. N=14	Curr Cord N=9	Other N=8	Combined N=114
. Case study	Good	Good	V. good	V. good	V. good	V. good
. Filmstrip	V. good *	Good	V. good	V. good	V. good	V. good
. Role play	V. good	Good	V. good	V. good	V. good	V. good
. Film	Good	Good	V. good	V. good	Good	Good
. Cassette	Good	Good	V. good	Good	V. good	Good
. Materials	Good	Good	Good	V. good	V. good	Good
. Catalogues	Good	Good	Good	V. good	Good	Good

How successful was the workshop in helping you achieve the following objectives:	Para N=33	Teacher N=50	Guid. Couns. N=14	Curr Cord N=9	Other N=8	Combined N=114
. Participants will be aware of the concept of modality incorporation style.	V. good	V. good	V. good	Excellent	V. good	V. good
. Participants will be able to select and develop activities and materials considering the learner's most efficient use of modalities to receive, integrate and express information.	V. good	Good	Good	V. good	V. good	Good
. Participants will be able to plan a program for a child based on the information given in a case study that will take into account the child's various strengths and weakness.	Good	Good	Good	Good	V. good	Good

* Very good

fit the particular setting. In site 1, where the instructor took a less active role in the module, it was less favorably received. Based on these results, it seems clear that the module is most effective as an educational tool when the instructor takes an active role and adapts the material to the particular setting. This conclusion is supported by the field testing results at site 2 in which little learning occurred until the instructor began taking an active role, setting deadlines and adapting the material.

The pre-assessment was poorly received and is in need of improvement. It was used in its original form in only one site. One instructor dismissed it as unrelated and others altered it or substituted a case history.

The data generated by the use, adaption and revision of the module enabled the CBTE project staff to develop detailed suggestions for how the module is best implemented and what revisions are necessary. This paper on how Modality Linking is best implemented is now included with the module materials.

Site 6 - Interpersonal Perception

The sample consisted of 23 students enrolled in a graduate course in special education. All but 2 of the students have had teaching experience but only 10 were currently employed in the field of special education.

Data from the "Instructor Questionnaire" and from the participant observer reports were not available. Conversation with the instructor indicated that only the first element was used. The instructor considered this part of the module to be excellent.

The "Student Evaluation Form" was completed by all 23 students. All aspects of the module were rated favorably except the post-assessment: the students were not sure the post-assessment was a true index of their achievement. Compared to other instructional material, the students rated the module as "about equal" in terms of educational content and "better" than

traditional approaches in terms of interest level and relevance to teaching. A list of student reactions to specific statements about the module is presented in Table 8.

Site 7 - Interpersonal Perception

The sample consisted of 9 students enrolled in graduate course which was taught by the module author. Eight of the 9 students had teaching experience and 4 were working in the special education field.

Data from participant observer reports and the "Instructor Questionnaire" were not available for this site. Conversation with the instructor indicated that the instructor took an active role, encouraging students, acting as a facilitator and evaluating student work. Little or no change was made in the module.

When asked their opinion on the "Student Evaluation Form" the reaction was mixed. Working with peers was rated highly, learning activities were judged to be sufficient in number and variety, and were judged to be enjoyable. The post-assessment received poor ratings and the students were "not sure" if the learning activities were responsible for their acquiring the competencies stated in the objectives. However, when compared to more traditional approaches to education, the module was rated "better" in terms of content, interest level and relevance to teaching. A list of student reactions to specific statements about the module are presented in Table 9.

Site 8 - Interpersonal Perception

The sample consisted of 9 students enrolled in a graduate course which was taught by the module author. All of the students had previous teaching experience and 6 of them are presently employed in the area of special education.

Table 8

Student Ratings of
Interpersonal Perception at Site 6

Statement	Student* Opinion
. The objective clearly describes the competency I had to demonstrate to successfully complete the module.	Agree
. I had a clear understanding of the steps necessary to complete the module.	Agree
. I had a clear understanding of what was expected of me.	Agree
. I had no difficulty finding the people who would work with me.	Strongly agree
. Teaming with a partner was an effective working arrangement.	Strongly agree
. Materials needed were easily available and/or clearly identifiable.	Agree
. The number and variety of instructional alternatives were sufficient.	Agree
. The learning activities presented in the module were responsible for my acquiring the competencies stated in the objective.	Agree
. The learning activities I selected were enjoyable learning experiences.	Agree
. The post-assessment activity measured the competency stated in the objective.	Agree
. The post-assessment result was a true index of my level of achievement.	Not sure
. The activities utilized learning time efficiently.	Agree

* N = 23

Table 9

Student Ratings of
Interpersonal Perception at Site 7

Statement	Student* Opinion
. The objective clearly describes the competency I had to demonstrate to successfully complete the module.	Not sure
. I had a clear understanding of the steps necessary to complete the module.	Agree
. I had a clear understanding of what was expected of me.	Not sure
. I had no difficulty finding the people who would work with me.	Agree
. Teaming with a partner was an effective working arrangement.	Strongly agree
. Materials needed were easily available and/or clearly identifiable.	Not sure
. The number and variety of instructional alternatives were sufficient.	Agree
. The learning activities presented in the module were responsible for my acquiring the competencies stated in the objective.	Not sure
. The learning activities I selected were enjoyable learning experiences.	Strongly agree
. The post-assessment activity measured the competency stated in the objective.	Not sure
. The post-assessment result was a true index of my level of achievement.	Disagree
. The activities utilized learning time efficiently.	Agree

* N = 9

Data from the participant observer reports were not available for this site. The instructor, responding to the "Instructor Questionnaire", indicated that 12 class periods were spent on the module and that there was little revision of the material. The instructor viewed her role as one of a consultant, facilitator and evaluator. She did not find it necessary to formally check on the progress of her students as they worked through the module. The instructor also indicated that the module was in need of an instructor's manual and more readings in the theoretical area.

Tabulation of the "Student Evaluation Form" indicated that the students viewed the module favorably. In terms of content, interest level and relevance to education, the module was rated as "better" than more traditional approaches. A list of student opinions on statements made about the module is presented in Table 10.

Site 9 - Interpersonal Perception.

The sample consisted of 10 graduate students enrolled in three classes at a private college. A total of 42 students had agreed to use the module. Of the 32 students who did not complete even part of the module, data are available on 10 students. No data is available on the other 22 students and none of the instructors returned the "Instructor Questionnaire".

The participant observer reports revealed that the module was added to the courses well after the beginning of the semester and it was offered as an option to taking the final exam or doing one assignment. The instructors took no part in the module, devoted no class time to the module other than introducing it and it seems likely that the instructors were not completely familiar with the module.

The data available from 10 of the 32 students who did not do even part of the module indicated that these students resented the idea of working

Table 10

Student Ratings of
Interpersonal Perception at Site 8

Statement	Student* Opinion
. The objective clearly describes the competency I had to demonstrate to successfully complete the module.	Agree
. I had a clear understanding of the steps necessary to complete the module.	Agree
. I had a clear understanding of what was expected of me.	Agree
. I had no difficulty finding the people who would work with me.	Agree
. Teaming with a partner was an effective working arrangement.	Agree
. Materials needed were easily available and/or clearly identifiable.	Not sure
. The number and variety of instructional alternatives were sufficient.	Agree
. The learning activities presented in the module were responsible for my acquiring the competencies stated in the objective.	Agree
. The learning activities I selected were enjoyable learning experiences.	Agree
. The post-assessment activity measured the competency stated in the objective.	Agree
. The post-assessment result was a true index of my level of achievement.	Agree
. The activities utilized learning time efficiently.	Agree

* N = 9

without instructor help, disliked the fact that no time was set aside for class discussion and resented spending extra time on what they considered experimental material.

Tabulation of the "Student Reaction Questionnaire" indicated that the 10 students who completed at least part of the module gave the activities unfavorable rating and they rated the module as "not as good as" conventional approaches in terms of content, interest and relevance.

Site 10 - Interpersonal Perception

The sample consisted of one new teacher working with a special education class of children with retarded mental development. The student holds a Master's Degree in education of the mentally retarded.

The student used the module on his own to receive inservice credit. There was no instructor involved. The CBTE project staff was available for those activities which required interaction with peers. The student's work in the module was judged to be "shallow" and "superficial" by the project staff and the module author.

Examination of the "Student Reaction Questionnaire" revealed that the student enjoyed the learning activities and gave fovarable ratings to the use of audio-visual equipment and the activity of teaching an academic skill to special children. The pre-assessment was rated as "not helpful at all." The readings and the role play activity were rated as "poor", and "fair" ratings were given to the experimental activities (Element 1, Activity 1) and the written reports analyzing interactions. A list of this student's responses are presented in Table 11.

Site 11 - Interpersonal Perception

The sample consisted of 4 special education teachers working with children with retarded mental development. Three of the teachers were

Table 11

Student Ratings of
Interpersonal Perception at Site 10

Questions	Student* Ratings
How would you rate the learning activities in terms of:	
. Sequence	Good
. Level of sophistication	Good
. Clarity of presented ideas	Good
. Kinds of tasks	Fair
. Amount of practice	Fair
. Provision for feedback	Poor
. Value of readings	Poor
. Value of experimental activities (Element I, Activity I)	Fair
. Value of role play activities	Poor
. Value of audio-visual activities	Good
. Value of written reports analyzing interactions	Fair
. Value of teaching an academic task to special children	Very good
. Overall value of activities	Fair
How would you rate:	
. The pre-assessment	Not helpful at all
. The post-assessment	Good
Did the module increase your:	
. Awareness of your feelings about disabilities	No
. Awareness of the feelings of others	No
. Ability to demonstrate empathy in teaching	No
How would you rate this module in comparison to materials in other courses in terms of:	
. Educational content	Not as good
. Interest level	About equal
. Relevance to teaching	About equal

* N = 1

interested in receiving inservice credit. Three of the teachers already had their Master's Degrees in special education and the fourth was working towards a Master's Degree. There was no instructor involved. One of the students taking the module agreed to serve as a coordinator.

Participant observer reports indicated that none of the students completed the module and only one completed a substantial part of the module. Interviews with the students revealed that the teacher acting as coordinator did not have enough time to devote to the module and thus the others "let things ride".

The student who completed a substantial part of the module made some suggestions which included: revising the "Teacher Observation Guide" (pp. 74-75 of module) to include specific behavioral goals, providing more "well-defined" evaluations after each element, and providing for more instructor involvement throughout the module.

Site 12 - Interpersonal Perception

The sample consisted of 4 special education teachers who work with socially maladjusted children. These teachers were some of the "newer members" of the staff and the principal of the school had suggested that they might take the module for inservice credit. The principal assigned one of the interested teachers to be the coordinator. During the first few weeks, these volunteer teachers worked through the assignments and the initial activities either during time before classes started or during a common prep period. Unfortunately, the coordinator had to withdraw because of personal reasons, and without a coordinator, the group apparently could not continue to function independently. An attempt by a Project staff member to assist in the scheduling met with little success. As a result, the module was never really implemented despite the fact that it had the support of the Principal and would have given the teachers some needed inservice credit.

Discussion - Interpersonal Perception

The module was poorly received at sites 9 and 10, the reaction was mixed at site 8, and the students did not complete the modules at sites 11 and 12. The module was favorably received at sites 7 and 9; however, only the first element of the module was used in site 7 and the module author was the instructor in site 9.

In the sites where the module was poorly received there was little or no instructor input or support. Clearly, this module cannot function in its present form as a self instructional package. The module functioned more effectively at 2 of the 3 sites in which the instructor took an active role and scheduled class time for the module activities. Criticism of the modules in all sites focused on the assessment procedures. Additional criticism was leveled at the learning activities at sites 7, 9, 10 and the clarity of the objectives at sites 7, 9 and 11. In addition, students working alone commented that the instructor needs to be more involved in the module.

It was concluded that the module, in its present form, is not an effective learning tool when used with little or no instructor input. Because most instructors, with the exception of the author, chose to implement the module without much instructor input, there is little data on its effectiveness. However, given the fact that at one of the 2 sites in which the module author used the materials, the module received a mixed reaction, there is an indication that the module is in need of revision.

Based on data collected from instructors, students and participant observers and based on the project staff's work with the module, suggestions for revision have been drawn up. These suggestions focus on a rewriting of the pre and post-assessments, a reorganization of some activities in the module and elimination of others. A paper detailing suggested revisions for this module is now included with the materials.

Site 13 - Family Reactions to the Handicapped Child

The sample consisted of 23 graduate students in special education. Background information was available for only 21 students. All of them had completed at least 4 courses in special education and 90% had teaching experience.

The participant observer reports indicated that the instructor introduced the module, administered the pre-assessment and spent part of one class discussing the readings in Element I. Thereafter the students were asked to work independently on the module. Participation was required of all students but successful completion of the module did not enter into the final grade.

Twenty three students filled out the "Student Reaction Questionnaire". Their ratings of the module were all "good" with the exception of the pre-assessment which was given a "fair" rating as a measure of true ability. The students rated their ability in the areas addressed by the module as "very good" before beginning the module and they rated the module as increasing their ability "somewhat". A major criticism offered by the students was that the module readings did not deal adequately with parents who are not successful in coping with handicapped children. The students' ratings of the module are found in Table 12.

The instructor gave the module higher ratings than the students. Examination of the "Instructor Questionnaire" revealed that various aspects of the module received "excellent" or "very good" ratings. The instructor also felt the module made too many demands and that some of the assignments should be reduced. The instructor's ratings are listed next to the student ratings in Table 12.

Table 12

Student and Instructor Ratings of
Family Reactions to the Handicapped Child at Site 13

Questions	Student* Ratings	Instructor Ratings
How would you rate the learning activities on the items that follow?		
. Sequence	Good	Very good
. Level of sophistication	Good	Very good
. Clarity of presented ideas	Good	Fair
. Kinds of tasks	Good	Fair
. Amount of practice	Good	Fair
. Provision for feedback	Good	Fair
. Overall value of activities	Good	Very good
. Value of readings	Good	Excellent
. Value of observation of children	Good	Excellent
. Value of interview with parents	Good	Excellent
. Value of acting as parent surrogate	Good	Excellent
. Value of seminar with students & instructor	Good	Very good
. Enjoyment of activities	Good	-
. Value of Observation & Interview Guides	Good	Good
. Relevance of pre-assessment	Good	-
. Pre-assessment as a true measure of ability	Fair	Very good
. Relevance of post-assessment	Good	-
. Post-assessment as a true measure of ability	Good	Very good
How much did the module increase your:		
. Understanding of what it means to be the parent of a handicapped child?	Somewhat	Excellent
. Awareness of how home life influences educational achievement?	Somewhat	Excellent
. Ability to analyze your own feelings towards parents of handicapped children?	Between somewhat & a great deal	Very good
How would you rate this module in comparison to materials used in other courses in terms of:		
. Educational content	About equal	-
. Interest level	About equal	-
. Relevance to teaching	About equal	-

* N = 21

Site 14 - Family Reactions to the Handicapped Child and How Parents Can Help

The sample consisted of 4 administrators, 2 teachers, a speech pathologist, a social worker and a learning consultant; a total of 9 students who used both modules.

Participant observer reports indicated that the students participated in a series of workshops totalling 20 hours. Fifteen class hours were devoted to the first module and 5 class hours devoted to the second module. In-service credit was not offered even though district superintendents suggested that the students participate. All students were assigned to do the whole module regardless of their score on the pre-assessment.

Information from the "Student Reaction Questionnaire" is available for 6 students on the first module and for 6 students on the second module. The students rated both modules very favorably. The assessments were given comparatively low ratings and the students thought the readings in the first module could be improved by including material on parents who adjusted poorly to a handicapped child. Student ratings of module I are presented in Table 13, and student ratings of module II are presented in Table 14.

The instructor filled out the "Instructor Questionnaire" for both modules of the module cluster. Her reactions were very favorable. The instructor indicated that she took an active role in the module, keeping close track of the student's work and providing continual feedback. The instructor also indicated that the readings for module I should include material about parents who have not learned to cope with their handicapped child. The instructor's ratings for both modules are presented along with the student ratings in Tables 13 and 14.

Site 15 - Family Reactions to the Handicapped Child

The sample consisted of 3 special education teachers from New York State. All were currently employed in the field of special education.

Table 13

Student and Instructor Ratings of
Family Reactions to the Handicapped Child at Site 14

Questions	Student* Ratings	Instructor Ratings
How would you rate the learning activities on the items that follow:		
. Sequence	Good	Excellent
. Level of sophistication	Good	Excellent
. Clarity of presented ideas	Good	Excellent
. Kinds of tasks	Very good	Excellent
. Amount of practice	Very good	Excellent
. Provision for feedback	Good	Excellent
. Overall value of activities	Very good	Very good
. Value of readings	Very good	Good
. Value of observation of children	Very good	Excellent
. Value of interview with parents	Excellent	Excellent
. Value of acting as parent surrogate	Excellent	Excellent
. Value of seminar with students & instructor	Very good	Excellent
. Enjoyment of activities	Very good	-
. Value of Observation & Interview Guides	Very good	Excellent
. Relevance of pre-assessment	Very good	-
. Pre-assessment as a true measure of ability	Good	Very good
. Relevance of post-assessment	Very good	-
. Post-assessment as a true measure of ability	Good	Good
How much did the module increase your:		
. Understanding of what it means to be the parent of a handicapped child?	Somewhat	-
. Awareness of how home life influences educational achievement?	Somewhat	-
. Ability to analyze your own feelings towards parents of handicapped children?	Between somewhat and a great deal	-
How would you rate this module in comparison to materials used in other courses in terms of:		
. Educational content	Better	-
. Interest level	Better	-
. Relevance to teaching	Much better	-

* N = 6

Table 14

Student and Instructor Ratings of
How Parents Can Help at Site 14

Questions	Student* Ratings	Instructor Ratings
How would you rate the learning activities on the items that follow?		
. Sequence	Very good	Very good
. Level of sophistication	Very good	Very good
. Clairty of presented ideas	Very good	Good
. Kinds of tasks	Very good	Very good
. Amount of practice	Very good	Good
. Provision for feedback	Good	Very good
. Overall value of activities	Very good	Excellent
. Value of readings	Excellent	Very good
. Value of survey	Very good	Very good
. Value of parent meeting	Very good	Excellent
. Observation of parents as teaching assistants	Excellent	Excellent
. Talk by parent and educator	Excellent	Excellent
. Value of films	Very good	Good
. Parent-teacher conference protocol	Good	Very good
. Writing scrips for parent-teacher conferences	Good	Very good
. Role play	Very good	Excellent
. Planning workshops	Very good	Excellent
. Guidelines for parent-teacher conferences	Very good	Excellent
. Enjoyment of activities	Very good	-
. Relevance of pre-assessment	Good	-
. Pre-assessment as a true measure of ability	Good	Very good
. Relevance of post-assessment	Good	-
. Post-assessment as a true measure of ability	Fair	Very good
How much did the module increase your:		
. Knowledge of how parents can be involved	Between somewhat & a great deal	-
. Skill in involving parents	Between somewhat & a great deal	-
How would you rate this module in comparison to materials used in other courses in terms of:		
. Educational content	Better	-
. Interest level	Better	-
. Relevance to teaching	Much better	-

* N = 6

A participant observer was not used for this site because the instructor was the same instructor involved with site 14. Consequently, another "Instructor Questionnaire" was not employed. The students were to have used both modules I and II in a series of four workshops. Only the first module was completed.

The three students filled out the "Student Reaction Questionnaire". They gave the module very favorable ratings. The assessments got comparatively poor ratings. The student ratings of the module are listed in Table 15.

Site 16 - Family Reactions to the Handicapped Child and How Parents Can Help

As part of an advanced graduate course, students reviewed and commented on both Family Reactions to the Handicapped Child and How Parents Can Help. Four students reviewed the first module and 2 students reviewed the second module.

The 4 students reviewing the first module were critical of the assessment procedures. They felt that the questions were poor in that they were too limiting (e.g. "name 3...,") and the tone of the language was objectionable. Also they felt the readings were dated and not realistic enough.

The two students reviewing the second module offered favorable remarks, made no criticisms, and suggested no revisions.

Site 17 - Family Reactions to the Handicapped Child

The sample consisted of 4 special education teachers enrolled in an in-service course. All of the students had previous teaching experience and had courses in special education. All of the students were working with children with retarded mental development. The observer report indicated that the instructor did not take an active role in the module and that the students were critical of the module.

Table 15

Student Ratings of
Family Reactions to the Handicapped Child at Site 15

Questions	Student* Ratings
How would you rate the learning activities on the items that follow:	
. Sequence	Excellent
. Level of sophistication	Very good
. Clarity of presented ideas	Excellent
. Kinds of tasks	Excellent
. Amount of practice	Excellent
. Provision for feedback	Very good
. Overall value of activities	Excellent
. Value of readings	Excellent
. Value of observation of children	Excellent
. Value of interview with parents	Excellent
. Value of acting as parent surrogate	Excellent
. Value of seminar with students & instructor	Excellent
. Enjoyment of activities	Excellent
. Value of Observation & Interview Guides	Excellent
. Relevance of pre-assessment	Good
. Pre-assessment as a true measure of ability	Good
. Relevance of post-assessment	Very good
. Post-assessment as a true measure of ability	Very good
How much did the module increase your:	
. Understanding of what it means to be the parent of a handicapped child?	Between somewhat & a great deal
. Awareness of how home life influences educational achievement?	Between somewhat & a great deal
. Ability to analyze your own feelings towards parents of handicapped children?	Between somewhat & a great deal
How would you rate this module in comparison to materials used in other courses in terms of	
. Educational content	Much better
. Interest level	Much better
. Relevance to teaching	Much better

* N = 3

Data is available from only one of the students who completed the module. This student felt the module did not increase his ability and he was particularly critical of the readings and the assessments.

Site 18 - Family Reactions to the Handicapped Child and How Parents Can Help

The sample consisted of 22 students enrolled in a graduate course in Special Education which was taught by the module author. Thirteen of the students had teaching experience and all had previously taken special education courses. The 2 modules comprised a 3 credit graduate course.

The participant observer attended all but one of the 13 class meetings devoted to the two modules. The report of the participant observer focused on two questions: what kind of instructor input is necessary for effective module use, and how effectively do the modules individualize instruction?

The instructor took an active role in the use of the module. She expanded upon the materials: by adding activities and lectures to prepare the students for the home observations, parent interviews and neighborhood trips, by offering clarification and critical appraisal of the readings, and by setting deadlines for the completion of assignments. It was the opinion of the participant observer that this input by the instructor made the module much more effective.

The module was designed so that an individual student or group of students could enter into the module at a level appropriate to their score on the pre-test and proceed through it independently. On the basis of the pre-assessment of module I, 3 students were exempted from doing the reading for module I. The instructor asked other students who scored well on the pre-assessment to do the reading anyway so that they could refine and build upon their knowledge. However, those exempted from the readings were not allowed to take the post-assessment before the others and they were required

to attend the class meetings devoted to the part of the module from which they were exempted.

The instructor also discouraged the students from taking the pre-assessment for the second module; she suggested that they all work through the activities. Thus, in terms of individual entry level, individualization was not well accomplished.

At many points in the module the material is presented so that the student can work independently. For example, a number of protocols of parent-teacher interactions are presented and students have to answer questions concerning them. The module instructs the students to complete these activities on their own and then check their answers in the appendix. The instructor altered these activities so that students gave their answers in class and class discussion decided which answer was correct. Although this change in the module resulted in less individualization, it seemed to make the activities more effective. The class discussion revealed that it was really impossible to specify one right answer. The class as a whole profited from the input of many students.

The "Student Reaction Questionnaire" was completed by 19 students. The student ratings of module I were "good" and "very good" with the exception of the assessments which were rated as "fair". They felt the module increased their ability between "somewhat" and "a great deal" and they rated the module as "better" than more traditional approaches.

Student ratings of module II were also favorable. The module received ratings of "good" and "very good" with the exception of a "fair" rating given to the pre-assessment as a true measure of the student's ability. The students felt the module increased their ability "somewhat" and they rated the module as "better" than more traditional approaches. Student ratings of module I are listed in Table 16; Student ratings of module II are presented in Table 17.

Table 16

Student and Instructor Ratings of
Family Reactions to the Handicapped Child at Site 18

Questions	Student* Ratings	Instructor Rating
How would you rate the learning activities on the items that follow?		
. Sequence	Very good	Very good
. Level of sophistication	Good	Very good
. Clarity of presented ideas	Very good	Very good
. Kinds of tasks	Good	Very good
. Amount of practice	Good	Fair
. Provision for feedback	Good	Fair
. Overall value of activities	Good	Very good
. Value of readings	Very good	Very good
. Value of observation of children	Very good	Very good
. Value of interview with parents	Very good	Very good
. Value of acting as parent surrogate	Good	Excellent
. Value of seminar with students & instructor	Very good	Very good
. Enjoyment of activities	Good	-
. Value of Observation & Interview Guides	Good	Good
. Relevance of pre-assessment	Fair	-
. Pre-assessment as a true measure of ability	Fair	Very good
. Relevance of post-assessment	Good	-
. Post-assessment as a true measure of ability	Fair	Very good
How much did the module increase your:		
. Understanding of what it means to be the parent of a handicapped child?	Between somewhat & a great deal	-
. Awareness of how home life influences educational achievement?	Between somewhat & a great deal	-
. Ability to analyze your own feelings towards parents of handicapped children?	Between somewhat & a great deal	-
How would you rate this module in comparison to materials used in other courses in terms of:		
. Educational content	Better	-
. Interest level	Better	-
. Relevance to teaching	Better	-

* N = 19

Table 17

Student and Instructor Ratings of
How Parents Can Help at Site 18

Questions	Student* Ratings	Instructor Rating
How would you rate the learning activities on the items that follow:		
. Sequence	Good	Excellent
. Level of sophistication	Good	Excellent
. Clarity of presented ideas	Good	Excellent
. Kinds of tasks	Good	Very good
. Amount of practice	Good	Very good
. Provision for feedback	Good	Good
. Overall value of activities	Good	Excellent
. Value of readings	Good	Very good
. Value of survey	Good	Very good
. Value of parent meeting	Good	Excellent
. Talk by parent and educator	Very good	Very good
. Value of films	Very good	Very good
. Parent-teacher conference protocol	Very good	Very good
. Writing scripts for parent-teacher conferences	Good	Excellent
. Role play	Good	Excellent
. Planning workshops	Good	Excellent
. Guidelines for parent-teacher conferences	Very good	Excellent
. Enjoyment of activities	Good	-
. Relevance of pre-assessment	Good	-
. Pre-assessment as a true measure of ability	Fair	Very good
. Relevance of post-assessment	Good	-
. Post-assessment as a true measure of ability	Good	Very good
How much did the module increase your:		
. Knowledge of how parents can be involved	Somewhat	-
. Skill in involving parents	Somewhat	-
. Skill in planning a workshop	Somewhat	-
How would you rate this module in comparison to materials used in other courses in terms of:		
. Educational content	Better	-
. Interest level	Better	-
. Relevance to teaching	Better	-

* N = 19

The instructor, responding to the "Instructor Questionnaire" generally gave both modules high ratings with the exception that the first module was rated as "fair" in terms of the amount of practice provided and the provision for feedback. The instructor felt that the modules made too many demands upon the students and suggested that the readings and some assignments be reduced. The instructor's ratings of the two modules are presented alongside the student ratings in Tables 16 and 17.

Discussion - Family Reactions to the Handicapped Child and How Parents Can Help

Family Reactions, was favorably received at sites 13, 14, 15 and 18; it was not well received at sites 16 and 17. The data from site 17 is in agreement with data collected on the other modules, namely that the modules do not function effectively in the absence of instructor input and support. The negative reaction the module received at site 16 must be considered apart from the other data since the module was not actually used in that site; the module was reviewed by 4 students.

How Parents Can Help, was favorably received in sites 14, 16 and 18. These sites include an inservice workshop, a graduate course, and the site in which the module was reviewed (not used) by 2 students.

Criticisms of the Family Reactions module revolved around the assessment procedures, the lack of readings about parents who have not learned to successfully cope with their handicapped child, and on the amount of work the module requires. Criticism of How Parents Can Help was directed at the assessment procedures.

It was concluded that both modules may serve as effective learning tools in a variety of educational settings including inservice workshops, and graduate courses. The module was judged to be effective by students who work with children with a wide variety of handicapping conditions.

Although it is apparent that the modules function best with strong instructor input, it is interesting to note that the Family Reactions module was favorably received in one setting in which instructor input was moderate and the students worked independently on most of the module activities.

The data collected from students, instructors and participant observers served as a basis for drawing up suggested revisions of the modules. The revisions take the form of improving the assessment procedures and reducing the amount of work required in the modules. A paper detailing the suggested revisions is now included with the materials.

Summary Comments

Modules are increasingly being used as a vehicle for providing the instruction that permits a teacher trainee or inservice teacher to acquire needed competencies. In the rush to implement CBTE programs, however, little heed has been paid to how these self-contained instructional packages should be developed and implemented to insure effective and efficient learning. For these reasons, the City University of New York Competency Based Teacher Education Project (CUNY-CBTEP) in Special Education undertook to carefully study "modularization", focusing particularly on the variables in the instructional setting that facilitate learning from modular materials for a wide range of students.

Four of the five* modules for the training of special education teachers that were developed for the purpose were submitted to a field testing that extended from the summer of 1974 through the fall of 1975. In most field test sites all of the content was used, but in several settings there was experimentation with parts of the module. Instructor interaction was an additional variable. Some instructors made extensive modifications or adaptations, others made moderate changes to accommodate students' needs while in a few instances instructors let the module do the whole job. On the college level modules were usually incorporated as additional or alternate assignments but in one instance the module cluster was the basis for the course. At the inservice level, "alternate" settings were explored. These included: (1) instructor input with a group of teachers within a school, (2) independent group work within a school and (3) independent study. In addition, one of the modules served as the basis for an intensive all-day workshop for the entire staff of a special education program.

*No data are available on the fifth, Parents as Partners as it was completed too late to be included in the field testing.

The field testing and evaluation was designed to test the effectiveness of the modules as learning tools under these varying contexts and to provide data on any needed revisions prior to widespread distribution. Data sources used included the following: students, instructors, observers and work samples. Information about time requirements, manner of implementation, reactions, achievement levels and suggested revisions were collected and analyzed.

For most contexts, the field test results indicate that the modules have done an effective job in the development of the competencies specified in the objectives particularly when instructors have modified the materials to match the sophistication level of their students and added activities which provide experiences with the handicapping population of interest. In addition, at the college level the effectiveness of the modules was enhanced w[illegible] the module was related to other work in the course. In in-service settings, where students already possessed minimal competence, expansion of the materials markedly increased performance levels.

A basic assumption often made by module developers has been that the instructional materials that they produce are capable of providing for individual differences. Because they have usually designed the modules to be self-instructional as well, the instructor's role would appear to be restricted to diagnosing needs, providing resources and assessing competency attainment. This conception of the instructor's role suggests that the content and format of these instructional materials should be effective for a wide range of learners without modification by the instructor.

One of the objectives of the field testing of the CUNY modules was to test the validity of this assumption. It was anticipated that if instructors were permitted to utilize the materials as they chose some conclusions could be reached.

In several settings the instructors did not modify the materials. They used the modules with their students as prescribed, limiting their role to one specified in the module. Only one instructor reported that students satisfactorily completed the materials. Adaptations to the materials were made by a number of the instructors. These adaptations dealt primarily with increased instructor involvement and/or elaboration of the materials. These instructors reported that students had successfully completed the materials.

The lower success rate for module implementation without instructor intervention suggests that while competency attainment is possible without instructor intervention some adaptation is usually necessary.

The student reactions provide some explanations of why more instructor interaction and some appropriate adaptation of the module materials is needed. Many students were unhappy about working independently and resisted it. Often they were overwhelmed by the modular materials. They were not used to dealing with objectives, unable to clearly interpret detailed instructions, often chose inappropriate (for them) options because they were the easiest to complete and they did not allow sufficient time to consolidate learnings. Despite the fact that students had the required prerequisites for undertaking the work, they frequently expressed a need to have the instructor provide a relevant frame of reference or theoretical underpinnings.

The participant observer reports and the instructor comments suggest that mastery of concepts suffered in instances where too heavy reliance was placed on peer evaluation. Often, peer evaluation was not sufficiently complete or critical to be efficacious. These data sources also pinpoint two additional contributing factors to limited conceptual understandings. Firstly, the reliance on experiential activities only to develop some of the concepts often limited the competence that a student acquired to a narrowly defined handicapping population. Secondly, the fact that many post-assessments

were written at a low taxonomic level and were available in advance prompted some students to do only enough work to be able to answer the post-assessment questions and to exit from a particular module.

These field test results indicate that if modular instruction is to be maximally effective for a wide range of students, the instructor's role as a curriculum agent needs to be continued. Since the modular contents broadly define what is to be taught the instructor is freed from developing lesson plans and presenting the materials and can focus instead on varying the use of the modular materials to increase their effectiveness with particular learners. It is much easier to enhance individualization this way then to try to provide it in a traditional classroom setting.

Some of the ways that instructors have effectively adapted the CUNY modules to student needs include the following:

1. Drawing on the students' prior experience when introducing a module to supplement or elaborate the module's overview.
2. Relating the module to other work in the course or highlighting its relevance to the classroom if the module is used in an inservice setting.
3. Rewriting or adding to the pre-assessment to provide for questions at a higher taxonomic level if the sophistication level of the students warrants this. An example of when this might be applicable is the adaptation of a module in an in-service setting.
4. Administering the pre-assessment prior to the student's exposure to the module contents.
5. Setting a higher criterion level for competency attainment if the purpose for using the module is to increase an already existing competence.

6. Setting up a time table of expected completion dates for each of the module parts and periodically checking on student progress.
7. Assisting in the formation of peer groupings.
8. Allowing class time or setting up office hours for questions of clarification and to provide for the expressed need of more instructor contact.
9. Evaluating students' assignments at critical points in the module and providing effective and early feedback.
10. Providing supplementary work assignments where needed.
11. Scheduling large group discussions to share experiences, clear up misconceptions and extend and consolidate concept acquisition.
12. Revising the post-assessment to include some measure of performance under simulated or actual classroom conditions.

The CUNY Special Education modules frequently make use of role play, peer groupings and A-V equipment in the learning process. Some observations gleaned from the field testing need to be included in this report. Role playing is effective in situations where at least some of the students have had first hand experience with the activity; it is less effective with students who have had little or no experience with the activity. One student wrote, "It is hard to act like a handicapped person when you have only briefly met a few of them." In cases where role plays are used, care should be taken to see that they are well written. Peer groupings proved to be a good working arrangement and helped cut down on the workload of the individuals. Often strong students were able to enhance the learnings of the weaker students. Caution should be exercised in using the peer groups for evaluation purposes, however videotaping was an effective learning tool especially in the

affective doman. Segments could be replayed to check perceptions. Films proved to be more effective than role plays for providing real life experiences.

Appendix

-

Samples of Data Collection Forms

Form for Module Review

This form was sent to potential field test participants along with copies of requested modules and a covering letter.

The return rate was poor and the kinds of comments provided indicated a rather superficial review of the materials.

Cecile Segal Room 1012
The City University of New York
Competency Based Teacher Education Project
315 Park Avenue South
New York, New York 10010

Form for Module Review

Name of Reviewer_____

Institution_____ Room_____

Name of Module Being Reviewed_____

The following categories are suggestive. Should you prefer a different format, please feel free to use it.

1. Content of Module

2. Format of Module

3. Implementation of Module

4. Effectiveness of Module

5. Other

Background Information

This kind of form was filled out by students at the initial class meeting when the modules were distributed. It was used to document the people characteristics of students using the materials. As with all of the forms, the Background Information, was usually adapted to the needs of the particular module and the content in which it was being field tested.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Cohen Module 1

1. I.D. _____ 2. Date _____

3. Demographic Data:

   a. Age ___ b. Sex ___Male ___Female

   c. Ethnic background ___White ___Black ____Hispanic ___Other_____
   (specify)

4. Instructional setting where module was introduced:

   a. Institution or organization_____

   b. Course number and name_____

   c. Course instructor_____

   d. Hours scheduled_____

   e. Course level ___Graduate ___Undergraduate ___Inservice

      ___Other (please specify)_____

5. Educational Background:

   a. Number of college courses completed in education:

      ___None ___1-3 ___4-6 ___7 or more

      How many of these college courses have been in special education?

      ___None ___1-3 ___4-6 ___7 or more

   b. Number of inservice courses completed in education

      ___None ___1-3 ___4 or more

      How many of these inservice courses have been in special education?

      ___None ___1-3 ___4 or more

   c. Do you have any other educational background in special education?

      ___Yes ___No

If yes, please describe briefly indicating kind and extent

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

d. Indicate which of the following statement(s) is (are) applicable to you:

___a. Undergraduate or graduate student concentrating in the following field of special education

_____ _____.
(indicate)

___b. Passed a course in or successfully completed a module on child development.

___c. Currently employed in a program for educating young handicapped children.

6. Teaching Experience

a. For each of the listed teaching situations, please indicate whether you have had experience and if so, at what level(s).

Situation	Experience	Level(s) of Experience
Tutoring	Yes No	Preschool Elem. Sec. Other
Student teaching	Yes No	Preschool Elem. Sec. Other
Regular teaching	Yes No	Preschool Elem. Sec. Other
Other	Yes No	Preschool Elem. Sec. Other

b. Did any of these teaching situations involve special education students below the college level? ___Yes ___No
If yes, please indicate category and level.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

c. Are you currently employed in the field of special education?
___Yes ___No
If Yes, in what capacity?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

7. Have you ever used the module format in any of your courses?
___Yes ___No
If yes, briefly describe

8. Learning style:

Listed below are specific ways of learning new material. Check the ones which are usually the most effective for you.

___Audio-visual materials_____
specify

___Discussion

___Lecture

___Performance (in a classroom or laboratory)

___Reading

___Taking notes

___Other_____
specify

___Don't know

Student Log

This kind of form was stapled to the back cover of the modules. Logs were constructed specifically for each of the modules. Students were asked to keep records of:

1. time spent on each activity
2. assessment procedures and results

The data provided were incomplete and often estimated at a later date. The form proved valuable, however, for student comments which were often volunteered. The "time data" originally hoped for from these forms were gotten from the student reaction questionnaire in questions directed to:

1. time spent in class
2. time spent out of class

I.D._____

STUDENT LOG

Cohen Module 1

A great deal of care has been given to the development of the module "FAMILY REACTIONS TO THE HANDICAPPED CHILD". We would like to know how effective it is when put in the hands of students. In order to do this, we ask that you keep an accurate log of your activities on the pages that follow. As you progress through the materials, please make notations in the appropriate sections of this log.

Please respond as honestly as possible. Your responses will be used to develop a better module. In order to insure that YOUR RESPONSES WILL BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL, your name does not appear anywhere.

I.D._____

PRE-ASSESSMENT

1. Schedule of pre-assessment — Date

   Started _____

   Completed _____

   Given to instructor _____

   Returned by instructor _____

2. Status of pre-assessment

   ___Full credit for competency; do not need to take the module

   ___Need to take the entire module (Entry level 1)

   ___Need to take selected parts of the module only (Entry level 2)

I.D. _____

ELEMENT I

(Assigned Readings)

1. Schedule of Activities
(FILL IN ONLY THOSE YOU DID)

	Dates	
	Started	Completed
Activity: Reading		
1. Barsch		
2. Kvaraceus		
3. Hosey		
4. The Exceptional Parent, 1971		
5. Ross		
6. The Exceptional Parent, 1973		
Activity: Questions, p. 20		

2. Assessment

a. Did you check your answers? ___Yes ___No

If yes, answer b and c.

b. Date of self-check _____

c. Results: ___Satisfactory ___Not Satisfactory

If not satisfactory, what further steps did you take?

(Indicate activities and dates.)

I.D._____

ELEMENT II

(Family Placement)

1. Schedule of activities
(FILL IN ONLY THOSE YOU DID)

	Dates		
	Started	Completed	Report(s) Finished
Activity 1 (Observation)			
Activity 2 (Interview)			

2. Assessment of Element II

a. Instructor acceptance of observation report: ___Yes ___No

If no, what further steps did you take?

(Include activities and dates.)

b. Instructor acceptance of interview summary: ___Yes ___No

If no, what further steps did you take?

(Indicate activities and dates.)

I.D._____

ELEMENT III

(Acting as a Parent Surrogate)

I. Schedule of Activities
(FILL IN ONLY THOSE YOU DID)

	Dates		
	Started	Completed	Report(s) Finished
Activity 1 (At home)			
Activity 2 (On excursion)			

ELEMENT IV

(Analysis of Attitudes and Feelings)

1. Date of discussion seminar _____

2. Number of students participating _____

3. Instructor satisfaction with analysis: ___Yes ___No

If no, what further steps did you take?

(Indicate activities and dates.)

I.D. _____

POST-ASSESSMENT

1. Schedule of post-assessment — Date

   Started _____

   Completed _____

   Given to instructor _____

   Returned by instructor _____

2. Status of post-assessment

   Satisfactorily completed ___Yes ___No

   If no, what further steps did you take? Give details to final completion.

Student Reaction Questionnaire

- Distributed to students after they had completed the module.
- Anonymity was insured by use of an I.D.
- Proved to be a valuable data source.
- Constructed specifically for each module.

I. D. _____

DATE _____

The module FAMILY REACTIONS TO THE HANDICAPPED CHILD which you were given is an instructional package which has been designed for use in teacher training courses.

Your perceptions of and attitudes toward the module can help us make it a more meaningful learning tool. You will perform a real service for us by completing the following form so data can be collected. Please respond as honestly as possible. Your responses will be used to develop a better module. YOUR RESPONSES WILL BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL AND WILL BE SEEN ONLY BY THE PROJECT STAFF.

CH1-React-1

A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. How did you feel when you were told about the assignment?

2. What were your feelings when you first saw the materials?

3. Did you participate in the field testing?
___ Yes, because it was required
___ Yes, even though it was optional
___ No

If yes, please answer the remaining questions.

If no, please go to question 26.

4. A. How much of the module did you do? _____ All _____ Part

B. If part, indicate which ones:

_____ Element I (Readings)

_____ Element II (Observation, Interview)

_____ Element III (Neighborhood trip)

_____ Element IV (Seminar)

5. A. It was estimated that the module would take approximately 20 hours to complete. Overall, how much time do you estimate it took you? (Include time in class and time outside of class.)

_____ Considerably less than what was estimated

_____ Less than what was estimated

_____ About the same as was estimated

_____ More than what was estimated

_____ Considerably more than what was estimated

B. What part of the time spent on the module relates to time spent <u>out of class</u>?

_____ Less than 1/4

_____ 1/4 - 1/3

_____ 1/3 - 1/2

_____ 1/2 - 2/3

_____ 2/3 - 3/4

_____ More than 3/4

6. Was the module related to other work in the course? ___ Yes ___ No

B. <u>MODULE PARTS</u>

7. Rate the module on the items that follow, using the following code:

1. Excellent
2. Very Good
3. Good
4. Fair
5. Poor
6. Not helpful at all

	<u>Rating</u> (Circle one)
<u>Overview</u>	
a. Clarity of statement of purpose of module	1 2 3 4 5 6
b. Expression of importance of module	1 2 3 4 5 6

7. (cont'd)

1. Excellent
2. Very Good
3. Good
4. Fair
5. Poor
6. Not helpful at all

	Rating (Circle one)
c. Your understanding of the competency to be demonstrated	1 2 3 4 5 6
d. Competency required as a reflection of the purpose of module	1 2 3 4 5 6
e. Outline of basic steps to complete module	1 2 3 4 5 6
f. Organization of ideas prior to going through module	1 2 3 4 5 6
g. Integration of ideas prior to going through module	1 2 3 4 5 6
Pre-Assessment	
h. Pre-assessment as a relevant measure of your understanding of parents of handicapped children and their role in the educational achievement of their children	1 2 3 4 5 6
i. Pre-assessment as a true measure of your ability	1 2 3 4 5 6
Learning Activities	
j. Sequence of presentation of ideas	1 2 3 4 5 6
k. Level of sophistication of presented ideas	1 2 3 4 5 6
l. Clarity of presented ideas	1 2 3 4 5 6
m. Kind of tasks	1 2 3 4 5 6
n. Amount of practice	1 2 3 4 5 6

7. (cont'd)

1. Excellent
2. Very Good
3. Good
4. Fair
5. Poor
6. Not helpful at all

	Rating (Circle one)
o. Provision for feedback	1 2 3 4 5 6
p. Overall value of activities for acquiring the competency	1 2 3 4 5 6
q. Value of readings	1 2 3 4 5 6
r. Value of observation of handicapped children	1 2 3 4 5 6
s. Value of interview with parents of handicapped child	1 2 3 4 5 6
t. Value of acting as parent surrogate for handicapped child	1 2 3 4 5 6
u. Value of seminar with fellow students and instructor	1 2 3 4 5 6
v. Enjoyment of activities	1 2 3 4 5 6
w. Value of Observation and Interview Guides	1 2 3 4 5 6
Post-Assessment	
x. Post-assessment as a relevant measure of your understanding of parents of handicapped children and their role in the educational achievement of their children	1 2 3 4 5 6
y. Post-Assessment as a true measure of your achievement	1 2 3 4 5 6

8. A. Would you have liked the instructor to introduce the module differently? _____ Yes _____ No
Please comment briefly.

B. Would you have liked the instructor's role in the module to have been different? _____ Yes _____ No

C. If yes, please explain how.

9. A. Are there any activities that you think should be added to the module? _____ Yes _____ No

B. If yes, please describe briefly.

10. A. Do you think any activities should be deleted or revised?

_____ Yes _____ No

B. If yes, please describe briefly.

11. A. Do you have any other suggestions for improving any of the basic parts? _____ Yes _____ No

B. If yes, please give details.

12. How important do you think the subject of this module is for a teacher trainee?

_____ Very important

_____ Important

_____ Somewhat important

_____ Of little importance

_____ Unnecessary

13. How important a role do you think parents play in the educability and education of their handicapped children?

_____ Very important

_____ Important

_____ Somewhat important

_____ Of little importance

_____ Unnecessary

14. How often do you think parents of handicapped children are willing to help in their children's educational development?

_____ Very often

_____ Often

_____ Sometimes

_____ Rarely

_____ Not at all

C. CARRYING OUT THE ACTIVITIES IN THE MODULE

15. How did you get the books you needed to read? (Check as many as apply.)

_____ College library

_____ Public library

_____ Made available by instructor

_____ Other _____
(specify)

16. A. Were there any books you had difficulty in finding? _____ Yes

_____ No

B. If yes, please indicate which ones.

17. A. Was there any difficulty encountered in making arrnagements for working with families of the handicapped? _____ Yes _____ No

B. How were arrangements made? Please explain briefly.

18. How uneasy were you in working with the families of handicapped children?

_____ Very uneasy throughout

_____ Somewhat uneasy throughout

_____ Uneasy at first, but later on, felt comfortable

_____ Comfortable throughout

19. A. Did you feel that the module made too many demands? _____ Yes

_____ No

B. If yes, please explain.

D. OVERALL VALUE OF THE MODULE

20. Before beginning the module, how would you rate:

A. Your understanding of the stresses and responsibilities involved in being the parents of a handicapped child:

_____ Excellent

_____ Very Good

_____ Good

_____ Fair

_____ Poor

B. Your awareness of the ways in which the home life of a handicapped child can influence his educability and educational achievement.

_____ Excellent

_____ Very Good

_____ Good

_____ Fair

_____ Poor

C. Your ability to analyze your own feelings toward parents of handicapped children.

_____ Excellent

_____ Very Good

_____ Good

_____ Fair

_____ Poor

21. A. Did the module increase your understanding of the stresses and responsibilities involved in being the parent of a handicapped child? _____ Yes _____ No

B. If yes, indicate how much you think the module increased your understanding? (Circle which one)

1	2	3	4	5
Very little		Somewhat		A great deal

22. A. Did the module increase your awareness of the ways in which the home life of an handicapped child can influence his educability and educational achievement? _____ Yes _____ No

B. If yes, indicate how much you think the module increased your awareness? (Circle which one)

1	2	3	4	5
Very little		Somewhat		A great deal

23. A. Did the module increase your ability to analyze your own feelings towards parents of handicapped children? _____ Yes _____ No

B. If yes, indicate how much you think the module increased your ability? (Circle which one)

1	2	3	4	5
Very little		Somewhat		A great deal

24. Comparative evaluation: If you have taken other education courses, how would you compare this module to materials and teaching methods used in other education courses?

A. In terms of quality of the educational content, this module is:

_____ Much better

_____ Better

_____ About equal

_____ Not as good

___ Much poorer

B. In terms of interest level, this module is:

_____ Much better

_____ Better

_____ About equal

_____ Not as good

_____ Much poorer

C. In terms of relevance to teaching, this module is:

_____ Much better

_____ Better

_____ About equal

_____ Not as good

_____ Much poorer

25. Additional Comments.

Please add any additional comments you may care to share with us about the module.

THIS COMPLETES YOUR PART IN THE QUESTIONNAIRE.
THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

CH1-React=12

I. D. _____

DATE _____

26. If you chose not to do the module, please explain why.
Be as honest and specific as you can.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

CH1-React-13

Instructor Reaction Questionnaire

Filled out by the instructor at the time that the students were filling out the "student" form.

Along with the observer reports, this form helped to document the process of implementation as well as provide perceptions and reactions.

INSTRUCTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

We are interested in your perceptions of and attitudes toward the module

that you used in your course

Your responses will be kept confidential and will be seen only by the project staff.

1. Name_____

2. Date_____

3. Instructional setting

   a. Course level: ___Undergraduate ___Graduate ___Inservice

   ___Other_____
   (specify)

   b. Type of program: ___Traditional ___Field based

   ___Other_____
   (specify)

4. Did you ever use the module format in any of your courses before?

   _____Yes _____No

A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. a. How much of the module did you use with your students?
_____All _____Part

b. If part, indicate which ones:

_____ Pre-Assessment

_____ Element I (Readings)

_____ Element II (Observations, Interviews)

_____ Element III (Babysitting, Neighborhood trip)

_____ Element IV (Seminar)

_____ Post-Assessment

2. a. How did you assign the module to your students?

_____ Required and part of the final grade

_____ Required but not part of the final grade

_____ Optional and part of the final grade

_____ Optional but not part of the final grade

_____ Other_____

_____

b. Did you provide any kind of overview when you introduced the module? _____Yes _____No
If yes, please describe briefly.

c. How many of the students in your course used the module?

_____ All

_____ Most

_____ Some

_____ A few

_____ Other_____

3. There are several places in the module where there may have been instructor contact for evaluation purposes. Indicate below what was the nature of your contact with your students. (Check as many as apply.)

_____ Oral comments in class

_____ Written comments

_____ Meeting with student(s)

_____ Assignment graded

_____ Other_____

_____

4. As the instructor, did your role include areas other than evaluation?
_____Yes _____No
If yes, please describe briefly.

5. a. How many class meetings were devoted in whole to the module? Please indicate number of sessions and describe content briefly.

b. How many class meetings were devoted in part to the module? Please indicate number of sessions and describe content briefly.

6. Do you think the module was designed to provide you with enough contact with your students? _____Yes _____No
Please describe briefly.

7. Do you think it is necessary to check on the progress of students as they work through the module?
_____Yes _____No
Please explain your answer.

8. Did you in any way influence the make-up of the small group or peer pairing? _____Yes _____No
If yes, how?

9. Was the module related to other work in the course?
_____Yes _____No

B. MODULE PARTS

10. Rate the module on the items that follow, using the following code:

1. Excellent
2. Very Good
3. Good
4. Fair
5. Poor
6. Not helpful at all

NA Not Applicable

Learning Activities	Rating (Circle one)						
a. Sequencing of ideas	1	2	3	4	5	6	NA
b. Level of sophistication	1	2	3	4	5	6	NA
c. Clarity	1	2	3	4	5	6	NA
d. Kinds of tasks	1	2	3	4	5	6	NA
e. Amount of practice	1	2	3	4	5	6	
f. Provision for feedback	1	2	3	4	5	6	NA
g. Overall value of activities for acquiring the competency	1	2	3	4	5	6	NA
h. Value of readings	1	2	3	4	5	6	NA
i. Value of observation of handicapped child	1	2	3	4	5	6	NA
j. Value of interview with parent	1	2	3	4	5	6	NA
k. Value of acting as parent surrogate	1	2	3	4	5	6	NA
l. Value of seminar with fellow students	1	2	3	4	5	6	NA
m. Value of guidelines provided for observation and interview	1	2	3	4	5	6	NA

11. Are there any activities, materials or readings that you think should have been added to the module?

____Yes _____No

If yes, please describe briefly.

12. Do you feel that any activities, materials or readings should be deleted or revised?

_____Yes _____No

If yes, please describe briefly.

13. Some activities were done by students working together.

a. Did the students have difficulty in making arrangements to meet with fellow students?

_____ Great difficulty

_____ Some difficulty

_____ No problem at all

b. Rate this method for facilitating learning:

_____ Excellent

_____ Very Good

_____ Good

_____ Fair

_____ Poor

c. Did you think that students evaluating each other's work provided them with adequate and appropriate feedback?

_____Yes _____No

Please explain your answer.

14. a. Did you think an Instructor's Manual was needed?

_____Yes _____No

b. If yes, how helpful was the Instructor's Manual?

_____ Excellent

_____ Very Good

_____ Good

_____ Fair

_____ Poor

c. What else would you have liked added to or deleted from the Instructor's Manual?

15. a. Did you think the Pre-Assessment adequately assessed the prerequisite learnings needed for undertaking the module?

_____Yes _____No

Please explain your answer.

b. Did you think the Pre-Assessment was a relevant measure of the competency: Understanding of parents of handicapped children and their role in the educational achievement of their children?

_____Yes _____No

Please explain your answer.

c. Rate the Pre-Assessment as a true measure of your students' competence.

_____ Excellent

_____ Very Good

_____ Good

_____ Fair

_____ Poor

_____ Did not have students do Pre-Assessment

16. a. Did you think the Post-Assessment was a relevant measure of the competency: Understanding of parents of handicapped children and their role in the educational achievement of their children?

_____Yes _____No

Please explain your answer.

b. Rate the Post-Assessment as a true measure of your students' competence.

_____ Excellent

_____ Very Good

_____ Good

_____ Fair

_____ Poor

_____ Did not have students do Post-Assessment

17. a. Was there any difficulty encountered in making arrangements for working with families of the handicapped?

_____Yes _____No

b. How were arrangements made?
Please explain briefly.

18. Overall, what was the major <u>difficulty</u> you encountered in using this module in your course?

19. Overall, what was the major <u>advantage</u> of using this module in your course?

20. One of the important aspects of using modules is that it enables students to work more independently from the instructor. What did you sense was the students' reactions to this aspect of the module?

C. EFFECTIVENESS

21. How successful was the module (or the parts you selected) in helping your students learn the following:

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Not helpful at all	Don't Know
a. To recognize the stresses and responsibilities involved in being the parent of a handicapped child.							
b. To make them aware of the ways in which the home life of a handicapped child can influence his educability and educational achievement.							
c. To analyze their feelings towards parents of handicapped children.							

22. Did the students integrate the material in the module with the material being taught in the rest of the course?

_____ A great deal

_____ Somewhat

_____ Very little

_____ Not at all

23. Did the module effectively <u>individualize</u> the materials?

_____Yes _____No

24. If you were to use the module again, what would you do differently?

D. EFFICIENCY

25. a. Do you think that the subject matter of this module would have been learned in less time with the use of other teaching methods?
_____Yes _____No

b. Do you think that the subject matter of the module could have been learned more effectively with the use of other teaching methods? _____Yes _____No

26. Do you think that the module made too many demands on students?
_____Yes _____No

27. In comparison to the teaching methods you usually use, how would you compare this module:

a. In terms of the time you spent.

b. In terms of your involvement.

28. Would you make any changes in the Instructor's role?

29. What suggestions do you have that might help other instructors who use the module for the first time?

30. Please add any additional comments you may care to share with us.

May we again say "Thank you" for your interest and participation.